

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application with claims 1 and 7 being amended by this response. New claims 12 and 13 have been added by this response. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 7 and new claims 12 and 13 can be found throughout the specification, specifically on page 17, lines 12-32 and figures 5a, 5b, and 5c. Specifically, the amendments to Claims 1 and 7 clarify that the change in the programming content that is displayed depends on whether the channel grid is highlighted or if the programming grid is highlighted.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by these amendments and new claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Alexander (WO 99/04561).

The present invention as claimed in claim 1 provides a method of processing a program guide. A determination is made to see if a cell in a channel grid of the program guide or a cell in a program grid of the program guide is highlighted. If a cell in the channel grid is highlighted, program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted channel grid is displayed. If a cell in the program grid is highlighted, the same program content is continually displayed. Thus, the program content displayed is dependent upon highlighting one of the channel grid and the program grid. Independent claim 7 contains similar features to those discussed above, and thus, all remarks presented herein apply to claim 7.

Alexander describes a system and method for displaying and recording control interfaces that improve upon previous electronic programming guides. Improvements over previous electronic programming guides include: improved viewer interaction capabilities; improved viewer control of video recording; parental controls; improved television access by the viewer; improved product opportunities for commercial advertisers; improved product information access; creation of user profiles; and utilization of profiles for customization and advertisements. (Abstract)

Alexander neither discloses nor suggests that “the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted, where the programming content of a second program is displayed which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted” as recited in amended claim 1 of the present invention. As the Office Action asserts in paragraph 4 describing Alexander, “[a]fter the “lock” status is selected, the last channel to which the tuner was set in the PIP is continued to be displayed regardless of the function selected by the viewer. Otherwise, in the ‘unlock’ status, the program highlighted by cursor 36 in grid guide 22 [, composed of a channel grid and a program grid,] is displayed if the grid guide is displaying currently telecast programs and the last currently telecast channel that was highlighted is displayed if the grid guide is displaying future programs.”

Alexander merely describes selecting a “lock/unlock” function to control how a Picture in Picture (PIP) screen displays programs. In Alexander, when the status is set to “unlock,” the PIP displays the program associated with the highlighted channel/program in the Grid Guide. As long as a channel in the channel grid and/or a current program in the program grid is highlighted, an associated program will be displayed. When the status is set to “lock,” the PIP display continues to display the same program content, regardless of what is highlighted on the Grid Guide. Thus, in Alexander, the program content

displayed is based on the setting of the lock/unlock function, where in the locked mode, it doesn't matter what part of the grid is highlighted as the same programming content will be displayed. This is unlike the present claimed invention in which the displayed program content is dependent on whether a cell in the program grid or a cell in the channel grid is highlighted. Program content of a highlighted channel is displayed when **a cell in the channel grid of the program guide** has been highlighted. The program content of the last tuned program is displayed when **a cell in the program grid of the program guide** is highlighted.

The present claimed invention provides for display of program content based on a highlighted cell in either a program or channel grid and not based on the status of a locked and unlocked function mode. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests "displaying, in response to the previous determining steps, program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted cell in the channel grid, if the cell in the channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Further, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests "continuing to display same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted" as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Additionally, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests that "the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted, where the programming content of a second program is displayed which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted" as recited in amended claim 1 of the present invention. Thus it is respectfully submitted that the rejection against claim 1 is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, similarly to claim 1, amended claim 7 recites that "the control means providing a first mode of operation in which when a cell in the

channel grid is highlighted by the user control device, the display window will display program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted cell in the channel grid ; and a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted, where the programming content of a second program is displayed which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted.” Thus, all remarks presented above with respect to claim 1 apply to claim 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection against claim 7 is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is dependent on independent claim 1 and is patentable for the same reasons stated above. Claim 4 is further considered patentable because Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “wherein the determining steps are entered into in response to a user selecting a user selectable option” as recited in claim 4 of the present invention. Alexander merely describes a user controlled “lock/unlock” function for determining the status of the PIP display. Alexander does not utilize the “lock/unlock” user selectable function to determine if a program or a channel grid is highlighted. Instead, the “lock/unlock” function is used to determine the program content displayed in the PIP. In contrast, the present claimed invention allows the user an option to select a cell in either the channel grid or program grid. This selection triggers a response of determining whether or not a channel grid or program grid has been highlighted. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor describes “wherein the determining steps are entered into in response to a user selecting a user selectable option” as recited in claim 4 of the present invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 4 is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 also contains similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 4, and thus, all remarks presented herein with respect to claim 4 apply to claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 9 is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 have been added to further define features of the present claimed invention. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, and specifically on page 17, lines 12-22 and in figures 5a, 5b, and 5c. As claims 12 and 13 are dependent on claims 1 and 7 respectively, all remarks presented herein with respect to claims 1 and 7 apply to claims 12 and 13. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12 and 13 are allowable and that no new matter is added by the new claims.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that Alexander does not anticipate the present claimed invention. As claims 2-6 and 8-11 are dependent on claims 1 and 7 respectively, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 7 discussed above. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that all the arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable. The Applicants invite the Examiner to call the Applicants' representative at 609-734-6809 to discuss this issues and arguments presented in this response/amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
Mao Uong Neil

Application No. 10/031,056
Customer No. 24498

Attorney Docket No. RCA89577

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609)-734-6809

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
March 11, 2008